



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

68
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,583	10/06/2000	Mike G. Gyde	H0001641	1855
7590	06/02/2005		EXAMINER	
Honeywell International Inc Law Department AB2 P O Box 2245 Morristown, NJ 07962-9806			NGUYEN, NHON D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	

DATE MAILED: 06/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/680,583	GYDE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen	2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____



DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to appeal brief, filed 02/24/2005.

Claims 1-17 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, 12 and 14 are independent claims.

Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-6, and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sinex (US 6,691,006).

As per claims 1, 7 and 14, Sinex teaches a computer implemented method and corresponding system for window management on a display, the display having a plurality of windows, wherein at least one window of the plurality of windows includes at least one checklist selection frame having a layout and a list of available checklists (52 of fig. 3; col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 5), and each of the available checklists having at least one task (56 of fig. 3; col. 5, line 64 – col. 6, line 5), comprising the steps/means:

Receiving a selection for a selected checklist from the list of available checklists; storing the layout of the at least one checklist selection frame from which the selected checklist is selected (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 17-32);

opening and displaying a window containing a graphical overview of information related to said selected checklist, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist (e.g., fig. 14; col. 13, lines 12-17).

As per claim 2, Sinex teaches the step of opening and displaying a window containing said graphical overview further comprises opening and displaying a synoptic frame including a synoptic page (e.g., fig. 14; col. 13, lines 12-17).

As per claims 3, 13 and 16, Sinex teaches:
displaying the tasks of selected checklist (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 17-32);
receiving an indication of a selected task from said selected checklist (e.g. selecting on “*revise*” buttons 96 of fig. 4);

displaying in said synoptic frame a synoptic page associated with said selected task, at least partially while said selected task is displayed (col. 13, lines 11-51).

As per claim 4, Sinex teaches repeating said task selecting and synoptic page displaying steps for each task in said checklist and restoring the stored frame layout (col. 13, lines 11-51).

As per claims 5 and 6, according to Sinex's system, window of fig. 3, for example, is a FMS frame and a navigational frame.

As per claim 12, it recites a combination of limitations recited in claims 1 and 2; therefore it is rejected as set forth in the rejection of claims 1 and 2, combined.

As per claims 15 and 17, Sinex teaches displaying the associated graphical overview includes the step of displaying a diagram (e.g. fig. 14; col. 13, lines 11-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 8, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinex in view of Southgate (US 5,561,757).

As per claims 8 and 10, Sinex teaches a method of window management on a display device for a checklist containing a plurality of tasks (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 17-32), said display device having a first display presented thereon, said first display having a frame layout having a first window therein, said method comprising the steps of:

listing at least one of the plurality of tasks in the checklist on the first display; receiving a selection for a selected task of the listed at least one task (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 17-32);

determining whether a synoptic window containing a graphical overview of information that is associated with said task should be displayed, wherein the graphical overview is not a checklist and storing the frame layout of the first display in memory (fig. 14; col. 13, lines 11-51).

Sinex does not teach reducing the size of the first window to a reduced window and displaying the reduced window. However, Southgate teaches that in col. 3, lines 33-45 and in col. 8, lines 14-27. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to use the teaching from Southgate of reducing the size of the first window in modified Sinex's system since it would fit more windows in the same display area;

Sinex further teaches displaying the synoptic window associated with said task while the reduced window is displayed (fig. 14; col. 13, lines 11-51);

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 10, Sinex teaches storing the first page layout prior to said second page displaying step (col. 3, line 64 – col. 4, line 37; frame 50 of fig. 3 is stored before frame 80 fig. 4 is displayed).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sinex in view of Southgate.

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Sinex does not disclose determining that the end of the checklist has been reached; determining that a frame layout is stored in memory; and restoring said stored frame layout. Examiner takes Official Notice that determining that the end of a checklist has been reached; determining that a previous frame layout is stored in

memory; and restoring the previous stored frame layout would have been obvious to one of the skill in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include determining that the end of a checklist has been reached; determining that a previous frame layout is stored in memory; and restoring the previous stored frame layout in Sinex's system since it would have made the process of restoring previous stored frame layout faster.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiries

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon (Gary) D Nguyen whose telephone number is (571)272-4139. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday with every other Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (571)272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nhon (Gary) Nguyen
May 27, 2005

BA HUYNH
PRIMARY EXAMINER